leagues as when recently we shared with all our agency executives a list of the giving of the combined board members of their agencies and asked for some assistance.

Of course, it can happen as Miller points out, that some agency executive, despite all explanation, may not wish to face reality, or may not be concerned with the process, but only with the end result which may be unfavorable for him and his agency. Such a situation is hardly a topic for a conference session unless we want to discuss ways and means to handle petulancy and obstinacy, whether professional or lay.

In conclusion, I should like to stress our obvious indebtedness, again, to Charles Miller for his clear and succinct statement of a complex theme, the edges of which we have been nibbling at in recent years.

A NEW LOOK AT LOCAL JEWISH COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION *

by HERMAN M. PEKARSKY

Executive Director, Jewish Community Council of Essex County, N. J.

SOMEONE has said that "we are living on that constantly moving line where history leaves off and prophecy begins."

We are too close to yesterday's events to view in proper historical perspective the immense changes that have taken place in the "Fifties." And it is certainly most hazardous to attempt a forecast for the years ahead. Nevertheless, some analysis is indicated and necessary.

Where do we begin our attempt to analyze what has happened and what looms before us in the "Soaring Sixties?" Since, at best, this paper must limit itself to only a few elements of significance to the American Jewish Community, and more specifically to central community organization, I shall deal with only two major areas of concern:

1. Central community organization: scope, structure, concepts, and relationships, in the light of recent developments.

2. Changes in the economic and social life of the community and family and their implications for our health and welfare programs.

Central Community Organizations: Scope, Structure, Concepts and Relationships

Many important events have taken place during the last ten years to change the face of the American community—general and Jewish:

a. An estimated 29 million Americans have been added since 1950—the largest increase in population in any decade in our country's history—to give us a population of 180 million. It is estimated that by 1970 our population will rise to 210 million.

b. Between April 1950 and April 1959 the population of the suburbs advanced from 34.7 million to 50 million.

c. During the same period the 168 metropolitan areas showed a population increase of 19%. However, the central cities in these areas increased their populations by only 1.5%, while the suburbs reported a 44% gain.

Generally, the suburb is an economically, ethnically, and occupationally homogeneous community of home owners. It is a reflection of our more affluent society, enjoying greater leisure and material benefits and containing the possibilities for a fuller and richer life.

It has been pointed out, over and over again, by political analysts, economists, sociologists, market researchers, home builders and the purveyors of creature

* Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, Atlantic City, N. J., May 20, 1960.

comforts that the surburban dweller conforms to a middle class system. There is a deliberate effort to keep up or down with the Joneses, in order to avoid attracting attention to what may be interpreted by the neighbors as bizarre or different behavior.

The flight to the suburbs has brought about many changes in the inner city. The population of the city is on the decline or at best stationary—this is especially so for the Jewish population. There is a siphoning off of the younger professional and business group and the better-off economically middle-age group. What we would call the potential leadership class is fast disappearing from the city neighborhoods. All this is resulting in an inner city Jewish population which is predominantly of the lower middle and low economic level, older age group, smaller size family, more inner-directed, less ready and able to assume leadership.

What is the meaning of these developments for the central Jewish community organization—federation, community council, or welfare fund?

The burgeoning of welfare funds for local, national, and overseas needs in the nineteen thirties reflected the development of a much greater common interest in the Jewish community, resulting in an extension of the appeal for campaign workers and contributors to elements and sectors in the Jewish community which hitherto had been touched only marginally, or not at all. Concomitantly there arose the demand and need for structural changes in Jewish communal organization; for broadening the base of representation and participation in policy making; for reflecting the views of those elements who by and large had remained onlookers until then.

To accomplish this objective a number of cities established community councils. The basic structural distinction between the federation and the council was the element of organizational delegate representation from a variety of fraternal, ideological and synagogue groups. At the same time some of the old-line federations revised their structure to give recognition to these elements in their policy making bodies.

Some 25 years have passed since the spread of the community council idea. There are questions as to whether the council idea of the thirties is the best instrument for the sixties, much in the same fashion as the federation was questioned in the thirties.

In the last two decades various forces have helped to homogenize, so to speak, the American Jewish community. To day 80% of the American Jews are native-born. Gaps based on the distinction between American-born and foreign-born are fast disappearing. Educationally and economically the gaps that existed in the past are closing up. Denominational religious affiliation is less a reflection of doctrinal difference and more the accident of location, synagogue accessibility, the circle of friends, the children's friends, loyalty to family tradition.

Many of the old line organizations are today decimated, weak, colorless, struggling to exist but unable to withstand the reaper, the ravages of time, and the events of history. For the bulk of the population the ideological differences of our parents and grandparents such as proletarianism, socialism, territorialism, diaspora nationalism, Zionism and anti-Zionism have little or no meaning.

The creation of the State of Israel has, by and large, removed from the American scene a very distinct and vital battleground of ideological conflict. Today the large majority of American Jews accept Israel as a fact. They recognize their responsibility to help financially through philanthropy and investment. They feel that the shaping and execution of Israel's domestic and foreign policy is the privilege and responsibility of the people of Israel. They do not wish to meddle in these affairs.

The suburbanites join community-wide organizations such as the League of Women Voters, PTA's, and Garden Clubs. They are active in national health drives, community chest campaigns and Red Cross Motor Corps. About the only identifiable Jewish-oriented organizations which suburban men and women join are primarily those which, over the years, have become fully Americanized and predominantly middle class and which fit in with the general pattern of American suburban living.

The major common denominator organization is the synagogue. Indeed, it has multiplied in numbers in the suburban setting. The suburban "back to the synagogue" movement, it has been pointed out, is hardly a "back to God" revival. Rather, it is an answer for a fully Americanized, middle and upper class population in search of a visible symbol of Jewish identity in the monochromatic suburban community. It has become a social center for the new immigrants to suburbia, as the city synagogue was the first answer for their immigrant parents and grandparents—with one great exception. Their grandparents found God more readily in the synagogue and were more apt to carry on a daily, or at least weekly, dialogue with Him. In the suburban temple it is the rabbi who is expected to carry on the dialogue with God as the "Sh'liach Zibbur" of his congregation.

Of the whole variegated complex of organized life which thrived and enriched the city-centered Jewish community of a generation and more ago, these are the institutions which by and large predominate today.

The diminution and weakening of the old-line organizational life of the urban center and the changing pattern of organizational life in the suburbs raise many questions about the validity of the basic concept of representation embodied in the community council. Many weaknesses are apparent today. We may assume that with further suburbanization and further increase of the American born and educated element in the Jewish population, this form of representation may become totally anachronistic.

Perhaps time is pushing us much closer to our original starting point and the closing of the circle. In the light of the changing American Jewish community does it not make sense to consider the many thousands of welfare fund participants as the basic and representative electorate of our central community organizations, as most federations originally conceived? Today the rationale is more logical and valid because we have mass support and mass participation.

I am not offering a specific prescription for central community structure. I do feel, however, that continuing changes and developments should alert us to the need for a re-examination of the present concepts and structures. But let us also remember that structure is secondary to purpose and function. In the final analysis it is leadership and program which are of prime importance.

And now let us take a brief look at our relationships with national and overseas agencies. Our community organizations have made a great deal of progress in the last ten years in developing and refining the processes and methods for sound and intelligent social planning for local needs. There is increasing knowledgeability and sophistication about the role and importance of social planning and the relationship of budgeting to planning. We can look forward to more progress and ingenuity in fashioning these instruments and

techniques as communities continue to mature and grow.

Unfortunately, we have not made as much progress in our planning and budgeting relationships with national agencies. There is a great deal to be desired, despite some notable efforts during the last decade. The Large City Budgeting Conference process has made tremendous strides since its inception in 1948. Jointly with the national agencies which have participated in this experimental program, we have evolved procedures and approaches for joint budget review and consultation, which fully respect rights and prerogatives of these agencies. At the same time there is a growing recognition and awareness that the communities have an important stake in the plans and programs of these agencies. On a mutually acceptable voluntary basis, there is developing more and more a sharing of concerns, ideas, plans, and responsibilities.

The communities and agencies participating in the LCBC relationship recognize that we are operating in an area in which there is a very meager accumulated experience for our mutual guidance. Jointly we are evolving a constructive process, developing guidelines, exploring areas of common interest, testing programs for validity and need, and establishing more objective criteria for community support.

One of the most constructive accomplishments of the LCBC was the formulation of the proposal for a study of the national Jewish cultural agencies and the recommendation to the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds that it undertake this study.

The LCBC also kept closely in touch with the monumental study of Jewish education which was undertaken by the American Association for Jewish Education with the encouragement of LCBC. The LCBC communities through this mutual process also assumed a substantial part of the cost of the study.

The fact that these studies were projected and completed and that their recommendations are now beginning to be implemented is further evidence of the fruitfulness resulting from the close working relationships between the communities and several national agencies and the growing up of the American Jewish community.

Both of these projects testify to the broadening concerns and interests of the central community organizations and represent a very strong affirmation of the desire of our communities to deepen our Jewish life and to strengthen the positive and more abiding elements of our Jewish purposes and goals.

However, at best, the efforts of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds and of the Large City Budgeting Conference, have not yet met with the success which our community needs dictate and which sound, democratic planning in a free society merits.

In the largest areas of American Jewish philanthropic concern—Israeli and overseas needs—we have made little progress. There is still only limited recognition of the fact that in the final analysis it is the people in the local communities who give and raise the money, and that it is the welfare funds, the creatures of these people, which have developed the structure and mechanism for successful fund-raising.

Yet, for all practical purposes, the central community organizations are still considered and treated as outsiders, or at best as sideline observers.

The local communities are disenfranchised in the planning and policy making decisions relating to service programs and dollar needs. There is no real accountability to the millions of contributors and the central local community organizations which represent them. This is pointedly illustrated by the recent reorganization of the American Jewish Agency for Israel. The role assigned to the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, as the representative of the communities, was that of a "sidewalk superintendent" who was invited to peep through one of the portholes in the fence erected to keep the inquisitive public from the actual construction job. In the makeup of the new organization, no formal recognition was given to community representation. While technically the reorganization represents some real gains and is a forward step in that it separates the Jewish Agency—New York from the Jewish Agency—Jerusalem, it is far from being a new or challenging instrument reflective of the interests and importance of the Jewish communities of America and of the central role they play to assure the continued well-being of the programs encompassed by the Jewish Agency.

We may expect that eventually the focus of national leadership will move closer to the grass roots of the local communities. It is in the nature of things that the people of the communities—especially the younger generation of American born leaders who are gradually moving to the center of the stage—will demand more policy-making roles in determining the destinies of the programs and projects which concern them as Jews—and for which they have the ultimate responsibility to give and raise the funds.

Perhaps it is too much to hope for a national Jewish welfare fund as a joint instrument of the national and overseas agencies and the communities. We may be expecting too much. But the day may come when the developing new local community leadership, as it matures, may move actively in this direction as a means for joint planning, budgeting and fund-raising and as a rational device for the elimination of the competitive pressures in the struggle for the division of the dollar. I am optimistic enough to believe that, in the foreseeable future, there will be radical changes in the relationship of local communities to the national agencies dedicated to American, Israeli, and other overseas programs.

To make our communities fully aware of needs and developments and to help recruit and train competent leadership calls for a much more informed public. We need to develop more intensive and well-rounded programs of education in Jewish civics and in-service training projects for young leadership. We need an American Jewish press which will provide in depth news of Jewish life, activities, and programs. To begin with, we need a world-wide news gathering agency under American Jewish auspices to present the news fully and objectively. We need news-gathering facilities in the American Jewish community which will mirror accurately and fully our accomplishments, problems, ideas, and goals. Regrettably, today the English Jewish press, by and large, gives the impression that all of Jewish life in America consists of fund-raising campaigns, anti-Semitic incidents, conventions and resolutions of national organizations, and a plethora of pronouncements by various national leaders.

I would hate to think that a hundred years hence the historian of the Jewish community would use the English Jewish press as his basic source material for a picture of Jewish life in the United States in the mid-twentieth century. There is much more to our Jewish life here. But this news is not gathered, it is not printed. Items of

transient value about happenings in other countries are dutifully reported and printed in our weekly newspapers, while events of much greater moment occurring in our own communities are not even noted.

I am hopeful that the "Sixties" will see the development of a news-gathering agency which will attempt to fill the void and which will give us broader and deeper coverage of Jewish life at home and abroad. When this happens, the Jewish community will have taken another step toward its maturation and fulfillment.

Changes in the Social and Economic Life of the Community and Family and their Implications for our Health and Welfare Agencies

Today the consumers of our voluntary social services are coming in greater numbers from the middle class, which represents the bulk of our welfare fund contributors and workers. As an organized community we have a concern and responsibility to plan, create, and make available to these people the services which they desire and need and which can best be provided under communal auspices. At the same time we have a continuing obligation to provide service to the less advantaged.

The cost of service continues to rise. The demand for service is increasing. The extension of services and building facilities to outlying suburban areas creates additional financial obligations.

In 1950 all welfare fund campaigns, including New York, raised a total gross of $142.2 million, in 1959—$130 million. The rise and decline in campaign results between 1950 and 1959 reflect variations in response to the changing situation overseas and domestic economic trends. Of the net distributed in 1950, $24.7 million was allocated for local needs. In 1958, $32 million.

In 1954 Jewish agencies received from chests and united funds $12 million; in 1959, $14.75 million. The annual welfare fund and community chest campaigns are not yielding enough additional revenue to keep up with rising costs and increased services.

To meet this constantly increasing financial burden we shall have to move in several directions: (1) a constant re-examination, improvement, and strengthening of our fund-raising machinery and recruitment, training, and involvement of new campaign leadership; (2) planning and promotion of endowment, insurance, legacy, and special fund programs, in which Cleveland has pioneered so successfully, as a continuing fund-raising resource; (3) development of a greater dollar yield from internal agency operations—more specifically greater fee income from the consumers of our services.

I should like to comment more fully on the last point. In most instances, fee scales of case work agencies, membership dues of community centers, and service charges for nursery schools, home camps and day camps are still geared, by and large, to the concept of service for an underprivileged group. By all means those unable to pay should continue to get service, as heretofore, and no one should be priced out of the market. But fee scales should be geared realistically to the cost of service and payment made by the consumers on the basis of ability to pay.

We shall have to examine the services we render and determine which should be self-supporting and which are entitled to deficit support from communal funds, and to what extent.

Let me cite an example: Our own Jewish Child Care Association recently arranged for fifteen hours of evening counselling service for families willing to pay a flat fee of $15 per session. This service supplements the regular program of the agency, which has a budget-re-

lated fee scale with a maximum of $18 per week, regardless of the number of sessions.

With little publicity the fifteen hour evening block of time was filled in four weeks by families willing to pay $15 per session. We know that in our own community there is a need for more of this kind of service. The next logical step may be the establishment of a suburban counselling center, under agency auspices, with fees scaled to cover the cost of service on a full self-support basis.

From time to time there is a re-echoing of the perennial question: what is "Jewish" about our communally supported agencies? There is a constant search for and reinterpretation of the Jewish component. There are declarations that some of the services are no longer viable as strictly sectarian Jewish operations and should become non-sectarian in board, staff, and clientele composition. Some stop short at this point and suggest that the only sectarian element that should remain under Jewish auspices and as a Jewish community responsibility is the financing of these non-sectarian services.

Most recently Joseph Willen asserted "that the goal of Jewish agencies should be to look forward to the day when they drop the strict sectarian practices which were born out of the failure of our American society to develop its ideal." As a first step Willen pleaded: "Let our Jewish-sponsored agencies develop primarily to serve Jewish needs, but open their doors to all wherever possible. Let our agencies retain their Jewish character, observe the Jewish holidays and festivals, the symbols and the spirit of our faith, but let them also reflect on their boards and on their staffs the composition of their clientele."

A colleague of Mr. Willen's, Graenum Berger, a few months earlier undertook the task of redefining the Jewish component in social work and asserted that this component is present and urgently needed in case work, group work, psychiatry and all the other fields of service.

Berger was very critical of the philosophy that "states that our agencies should be open to all people irrespective of race, religion, color, or ethnic origin . . ." He found fault with the proposal that we should employ non-Jews on staff or "try to entice non-Jews on our boards." He stated that "a more deliberate program for the dilution and the eventual dissolution of Jewish life would be harder to find . . . It posits an ideological position leading to self-extinction, although Judaism has always proscribed suicide."

I am sure that this question will be discussed and debated for many years. It will not be resolved by preconceived plans or dictates. Changes will occur as the character of the American Jewish community changes. There is no agreement today on the definition of the Jewish component and we certainly cannot anticipate its rationale and meaning in years to come. Some may wish to agree with Willen's plaintive words that he "desperately wanted to cross that street, see and be part of the larger world outside" and may join him. Others may be more content with Alfred Kazin's view of his Jewish odyssey which he epitomized in the phrase: "Brownsville is that road which every road in my life has had to cross."

But what is most important to keep in mind is that the basic issue is not so much how we should enlarge and deepen the Jewish content of social work per se, but much more that we should have an understanding of, and respect for, Jewish values and traditions so that through our social work skills and knowledge we can strengthen and develop the individual and enable him to utilize constructively and meaningfully his Jewish experience and heritage in his own daily

life and in the development and shaping of his family. Such a person would also add strength and depth to Jewish community purpose and activity.

No preview of the decade ahead can afford to ignore the importance of public welfare and tax funds in the shaping of our communal programs.

Aside from meeting the basic economic requirements of those in need, there is a continuing expansion of government services into other health and welfare areas. We may assume that this trend will continue to provide, even more substantially, for mental health services, vocational retraining and rehabilitation, child welfare programs, medical services and other projects. We may also assume that there will be constantly increasing payments by government to voluntary agencies for the purchase of services and for experimentation and research.

The expanded and broadened provisions of various programs under direct government auspices, will help to meet needs more adequately and will strengthen the basic underpinning of our total social welfare structure. This should also help relieve many pressures on voluntary agencies, ease the financial problems of private philanthropic management, and free funds for new programs and activities.

There are those who are concerned with the consequences of increased tax-fund payments for services under sectarian auspices. Questions are being raised about the dangers which this practice presents for the traditional and historical concept of separation between church and state. There are those who express fear about governmental interference in the operations of voluntary agencies through the insistence on more detailed and regular accountability, demand for additional standards, and more intensive supervision of their application.

The increasing availability of public funds for use by private social agencies also has some implications for social planning. These funds may lure agencies from their basic services and purposes into areas of research and experimentation for which tax-funds may be available and may divert agencies from their main concern with specific areas of community function.

Under certain conditions, even the purchase of traditional agency service could be questioned, particularly if a governmental body adheres to the concept that its role is at most secondary and supplementary to that of private agencies. All of the citizens of a free society, if they require services, are entitled to receive them. It is beyond the capacity of private social agencies to serve all people. Where government can purchase service from private agencies, it may be deterred from setting up adequate programs under its own auspices.

It is often emphasized that use of public funds by private agencies has demonstration values. There are those who feel, however, that demonstration projects have a tendency to become institutionalized, slowing up governmental assumption of primary responsibility.

There are many important plus values for voluntary social work in the continuing development of governmental welfare services and in the increasing volume of tax fund support for sectarian social work. The problems that are envisioned and the fears and anxieties which are being aroused will be resolved pragmatically, as we continue to work and live with these developments.

While there is concern about the effect of more governmental participation in the work of the voluntary agencies, we must note with even greater concern what has happened to the *volunteers* in our voluntary agencies. Fortunately, there is some discussion and soul search-

ing about the role of the volunteer in social agencies and about what can be done to save this previously bountiful, but presently rare, specimen from extinction.

But let us not blame only ourselves or our own generation for this perplexing plight. The problem is historical and has become progressively more serious and apparent as the professionalization of social work has moved forward.

Back in 1905 Mary Richmond observed that "during this last decade . . . our national habit of thought has exhalted the expert and the professional at the expense of the volunteer . . ." And in 1913 she commented despairingly that "this world is not a stage upon which we professional workers are to exercise our talents, while the volunteers do nothing but furnish the gate-receipts and an open-mouthed admiration of our performances."

While Mary Richmond was concerned with the declining role of the volunteer in direct client service, at a time when increasing professional knowledge and skill militated against him, the process of moving the volunteer off the stage in almost all areas of social work, except fund-raising, has continued relentlessly over the years. The volunteer became the victim of progress in the field of social work due to increased professionalization and the accelerated development of impersonal, federated fund-raising soon after World War I and the release of functional agencies from this responsibility.

Samuel Mencher in "Issues in American Social Work" observes that federated fund-raising represents "the final phase of divorcing voluntaryism from private social welfare. The role of voluntaryism has changed from doing to giving . . .," in his opinion.

And yet the future existence and flourishing of voluntary social work calls for a rebirth of programs for volunteer participation and activity in our functional agencies. We must find meaningful and satisfying opportunities for volunteer service beyond the level of stuffing envelopes, serving on telephone squads, or acting as hostesses at dinners and receptions.

Some updated and useful programs of volunteer activity have been gradually developing—for example, the growth of friendly visiting programs for the aged; the reconstitution of big brother and big sister programs within the current context of treatment for the emotionally disturbed child. We need more of this kind of rethinking of the role of the volunteer. There must be a willingness to experiment with volunteer programs and projects which may yield lasting values and constructive results.

I am not proposing that we turn over to the volunteer the functions of the professional worker. But there is some room for analysis and re-evaluation of the job content of the professional worker. Perhaps there are some fringe areas of activity which could be turned over to the volunteer, thus enabling the practitioner to use his released time for work where his skill and knowledge are most valuable.

I am proposing that the challenge is before us to develop new opportunities, new worthwhile volunteer projects to complement and supplement the work of the professional staff. We need the help of the many people who have an interest in our programs, who can become informed interpreters and supporters of our activities. At the same time we can give them a sense of fulfillment, a feeling of doing something worthwhile—yes, indeed, a sense of being wanted. Must we only concern ourselves with building up this feeling of being wanted and useful in those who come to us as clients?

We need the volunteer as much or

more than the volunteer needs us. Yes, let us be selfish and helping at the same time. For our future is mutually dependent and intertwined.

Conclusion

I have tried to give one man's reading of the signs on the road we just passed and of the signs which we shall read as we travel the road of the "Soaring Sixties," or the "Searching Sixties," as someone very appropriately remarked. My reading of yesterday's signs may be blurred because we travelled too fast and too far for clear observation. The signs ahead may be even more difficult to scan since man proposes to conquer space, time, and distance.

Of these things, however, we may be certain: we must keep our feet firmly on the ground and cast our vision beyond the horizon; we must be clear about our goals; we must have a deep respect for our profession; a deeper belief in the value of our work; a restless desire to question and probe and challenge; and above all, an abiding faith in the worth and dignity of man.

RESEARCH IN A JEWISH COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION; ITS PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES*

by JUDAH RUBINSTEIN

Jewish Community Federation, Cleveland, Ohio

Beginnings in Research in the Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland

RESEARCH in a Jewish community organization setting is not a special branch of social work research. Community organization shares the same need as other areas of social work for facts to guide its decisions and employs research as an instrument of data collection in its problem-solving processes. The issues concerning content, method, objectives, and role, which mark so many research programs in the fields of health, welfare, and recreation, are not left behind by changing sponsors. If anything, the problems are multiplied because little of social work concern is unrelated directly or indirectly to the work of the community organization agency. At the same time, social work research is an ill-defined term; research in a social agency virtually becomes what it does or attempts to do. This case history, at least, takes no exception to so convenient a definition in reviewing its own research experience.

The parent body of the Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland, the Federation of Jewish Charities, was organized in the year 1903, and its research department in 1956. These two dates are not the beginning of a local chronicle describing the evolution of Federation research. They attest simply that 53 years passed before a major Jewish community organization formally designated research as part of its structure. Since the agency from the beginning carried on many tasks now grouped under the title of research, the somewhat intriguing question arises as to what factors shaped the decision four years ago to add this function to the central community service.

The Federation research department is the outgrowth of need and opportunity and well-conceived administrative strategy. The Federation since its earliest years, of course, utilized facts in discharging its responsibilities. The same questions: how money is spent, how much service is provided, how effective it is, what services should be increased, and what needs are unmet required answering then and now. The difference lies in the answer process. The rise of Federation along with the Cleveland Jewish community outmoded social welfare decisions based on good intentions, individual prestige, and a smattering of related facts. The great transformation in the size and composition of the community fashion by the basic forces of American life became strikingly apparent in the years following the Second World War. Economic and social mo-

* Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, Atlantic City, N. J., May 23, 1960.